

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

John

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FII	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/652,024	10/652,024 09/02/2003		Frederik De Meyer	Q76821	Q76821 1523		
23373	7590	10/03/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER		
SUGHRUE 2100 PENNS	,	PLLC A AVENUE, N.W.	HARTMAN JE	HARTMAN JR, RONALD D			
SUITE 800				ART UNIT .	PAPER NUMBER		
WASHING?	TON, DC	20037		2121			

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/652,024	DE MEYER ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Ronald D. Hartman Jr.	2121					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DOWN - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONI	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 S</u>	eptember 2003						
·	•						
·	, 						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-36</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) <u>1-36</u> are subject to restriction and/or e	election requirement						
	sicolion requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine							
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	• • •	` '					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) △ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) △ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. △ Certified copies of the priority documents 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents 	s have been received.						
 Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau 	rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ed in this National Stage					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	∋d.					
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I	Pate					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6)						

Application/Control Number: 10/652,024

Art Unit: 2121

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 15-24, drawn to a system for controlling a technical installation, classified in class 700, subclass 17; and
- II. Claims 25-36, drawn to a network based system for controlling a technical installation, classified in class 709, subclass 201.

Inventions I are II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination I has separate utility such as in a system lacking the requirement of being network based, wherein a server and network terminal are required, wherein the server comprises a managing device and a managing and assigning device, and wherein a communications module comprises the network terminal and a loading device, as required by Invention II. Invention II has separate utility such as in a system that requires the managing device, the managing and assigning device and the loading device to be centrally located in a data module, without utilization of a network based communication system, as required by Invention I. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

The examiner has required restriction between subcombinations usable together. Where applicant elects a subcombination and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

Application/Control Number: 10/652,024

Art Unit: 2121

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Claims 1-14 link(s) inventions I and II. The restriction requirement between the linked inventions is **subject to** the nonallowance of the linking claim(s), claims 1-14. Upon the indication of allowability of the linking claim(s), the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions **shall** be withdrawn and any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be rejoined and fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104 **Claims that require all the limitations of an allowable linking claim** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

Applicant(s) are advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, the allowable linking claim, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Where a restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. *In re Ziegler*, 443 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of

Application/Control Number: 10/652,024

Art Unit: 2121

record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103 (a) of the other invention.

Page 4

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ronald D. Hartman Jr. whose telephone number is (571) 272-3684. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri., 11:00 - 8:30 pm, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Knight can be reached on (571) 272-3687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RDH September 28, 2006

X RDH

Ronald D Hartman Jr. Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2121

Reald of Hatimah